













[illegible]

And now, sir, we have the last republication of this story. Now we are threatened with dissolution of the Union unless we will consent to what no republican Government ever did consent to; what is in direct opposition to the principles and spirit of our institutions and is condemned by the earliest and best precedents of our history, namely, the extension of slavery into Territories now free. Shall we yield to this outcry? For one, I say, never! In my judgment, it is time to pause. We have yielded point after point; we have crowded concession on concession until duty, honor, patriotism, shame, demands that we should stop.

But we are told, almost with the tone of taunt, that the free States have held the majority all this time in our brave

of Congress at least, and in the electoral college, and, therefore, that whatever responsibility there may have been in these concessions to slavery, it is upon them. I do not mean to say that the free States have had the right to insist upon this. The free States have had the right to insist upon the right of the people to elect a majority; and the victors of the battle have been bound to their divisions. John Randolph said, long ago, "We the South are always united and can always unite; while you of the North divide. We have conquered you once and we can and we will conquer you again." These two sentences make a history.

I do not say and I do not mean to say, that there has been but one political party in the slave States; that there has been one political party to the interests of slavery; that these States, fidelity to the interests of slavery has been, in both parties, an indispensable condition of support.

[illegible][illegible]

that the Federal Government is bound by the Constitution to protect the rights of the citizen to the same extent and in the same manner as the rights of owners in any description of property whatever. I would now inquire of the Senator whether he would not agree to the same question. I will endeavor to answer it if he will repeat it.

MR. CHASE. I inquired of the Senator from Georgia, MR. DAWSON, whether in his judgment citizen of a slave State, who has acquired property in the Territories acquired from Mexico, would be entitled, under the Constitution, to the recognition and protection of his claim to that property. He answered in the affirmative, and more precisely as he would be to the recognition and protection of his rights as owner of property of any description. The Senator replied in the affirmative. I then added that I believed the Senator from Alabama, who had just taken the opinion.

MR. KING. The opinion I entertain is this: that in every case where a citizen of the United States has acquired property by purchase, every citizen of every State in the Union

We entitled to participate. With regard to taking slaves from one territory to another, the Government that may be formed for the territories is not supposed to have power to form such governments is supposed to exist under the Constitution. Whether it does or not, such has been the policy of the Government. When a territorial government is established, it is only for the protection of persons and property and the preservation of order and peace. It is not to be a government of property. That is my opinion. I believe that whenever a territorial government is established, if persons hold slaves in that territory, they are liable to be taken from them, and it is bound to protect them until the people of that territory are sufficient for the formation of a State Constitution. Then, we of the South hold, I believe without error, that the Government is bound to protect them, and they have a right to prohibit or to permit slavery at their pleasure, and that Congress has no right to prevent the new States from doing as they please. I think that we should only look at its Constitution to ascertain whether it is republican in its character. Am I understood?

Yes, Sir. The Senator from Georgia. We understand precisely that the Senator from Georgia. We understand

[illegible]

Mr. CHASE. I have already said, Mr. President, that I do not at all concur in that doctrine.

Mr. DAWSON. I have already made an exposition of the mode and manner in which the South vote. I wish to ask him if, with one or two exceptions, every Southern man would not vote for the man who is the best qualified for the very candidate for whom the Senator voted at the last Presidential election? So that history is against the position which the Senator occupies, and the South has only one alternative.

Mr. CHASE. "Circumstances," it said, "alterances." [Laughter.] I rather think that Mr. Van Buren, occupying the position which the Senator occupies, would not have been a very acceptable candidate to our Southern friends, however nominated. At any rate, he would not have been a very acceptable candidate to over a hundred votes of so many, in all the slave States.

Mr. DAWSON. The party had another candidate.

Mr. CHASE. And another platform.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no objection to your vote, I am quite as much to our platform as our candidate.

Mr. President, disguise is vain. We cannot shut our eyes to the obvious.

stamped upon every page of our political history for 50 years. Let the test be made, if gentlemen desire. I only say, for one, that I will not stand by the side of any man who is willing to do so. Let us cease from endeavoring to agree in the support of the same candidate upon opposite grounds. Let us have political platforms, while we have them, which shall be the basis of our action. Let candidates who cannot be represented in the North as in favor of freedom, and in the South as supporters of slavery, withdraw from the contest. Let us have a party of principles, and the policy of ambiguous expressions are equally obnoxious. Both mislead public judgment and divide the party. Let us have a party which shall be known by a policy which is clear, and a policy which adopts the latter, succeeds, one or the other section of the country must be disappointed.

Mr. President, honesty is the best policy I propose, the only policy I propose, for the success of the business of this union in a political organization. Holding fast as I do to democratic principles; believing firmly that all men are created equal, and that all are entitled to the same inalienable rights to life and liberty, I desire to see those principles carried out boldly, earnestly, resolutely, in the practical conduct of our government.

This Constitution for America is the great object which the Constitution indicates: for the perfection of our Union; for the establishment of justice; for the common good of all. We see this Government, under the influence of any zeal, how ever honorable, for freedom, transcended at all the sphere of our duty. We shall not support any legislation for the establishment and security of freedom in the Territories and slave States. We shall, as securely, refuse my support to all legislation of the subject of slavery within the States. In this line of action I shall feel myself supported by the example of the founders of the Republic, by the original policy of the Government, and by the principles of the Constitution.

It is to be regretted that it is larger in such course. Least of all does the state cry of disunion alarm me. Merely generally, add remedies to evils. But what evil shall I add to the evil of slavery? Shall I add to the evil of slavery in the Territories? Will it procure the return of fugitives? Will it suppress discussion? Will it secure

[illegible]

the sentiments of the people throughout the land, and there are the arts or the fears of politicians or capitalists may suppress their utterance; but they live, and will live, in the hearts of the masses. There is no great and real change these opinions and convictions which placed a majority pledged to Free Soil in the other wing of the Capitol. It may be, however, that you will not be so satisfied that the people will be able to secure the settlement carried through the forms of legislation. But the people will unsettle your settlement. It may be that you will determine that the territory will be secured by law against the progress of slavery. The people will reverse your determination. It may be that you will succeed in burying the Ordinance of Freedom. The people will dig it up and resurrect it. The same history which records its resurrection may also inform posterity that they who fancied they had killed the *Proviso*, only committed political suicide.

"I shall rise again."